

## Durham Research Online

---

### Deposited in DRO:

04 December 2017

### Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

### Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

### Citation for published item:

Kelly, James E. (2014) 'Conformity, loyalty and the Jesuit mission to England of 1580.', in Religious tolerance in the Atlantic world : early modern and contemporary perspectives. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 149-170.

### Further information on publisher's website:

[https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137028044\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137028044_7)

### Publisher's copyright statement:

James E. Kelly, Conformity, Loyalty and the Jesuit Mission to England of 1580, 2014, Palgrave Macmillan reproduced with permission of Palgrave Macmillan. This extract is taken from the author's original manuscript and has not been edited. The definitive, published, version of record is available here: <http://www.palgrave.com/gb/book/9781137028037>

### Additional information:

---

### Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

## **Conformity, Loyalty and the Jesuit Mission to England of 1580<sup>1</sup>**

**James E. Kelly**

In Elizabethan England, under the 1559 Act of Uniformity, church attendance was compulsory on Sundays and Holy Days for all those aged 14 or over. The law was enforced ‘upon payne of punishment by the Censures of the Church, and also upon payne that every p[er]son so offending shall forfeite for every suche offence twelve pens’.<sup>2</sup> The 1581 Act imposed a fine of 20 pounds a month on Catholic recusants – a huge leap from the normal 12 pence.<sup>3</sup> Obviously the authorities had become uneasy following the 1580 arrival of the Jesuits Edmund Campion and Robert Persons, who challenged the Elizabethan regime’s legitimacy by urging Catholics not to attend the state Church.<sup>4</sup> Reports for non-attendance may have been many, but the number of parishioners not receiving communion was even more significant. Church papistry was a major reason for non-reception. Communion had to be taken at least three times a year, usually at Whitsunday, Easter and Christmas. According to one John Earle as late as 1628, church papists always found a way to avoid receiving this sacrament that they viewed as an aberration of the true communion:

Once a moneth he presents himselfe at the Church, to keepe off the Church-warden, and brings in his body to save his bayle. He kneels with the Congregation, but prayes by himselfe, and askes God forgiveness for coming thither. If he be forced to stay out a Sermon, he puls his hat over his eyes, and frownes out the houre, and when hee comes home, thinkes to make

amends by abusing the Preacher. His maine policy is to shift off the Communion, for which he is never unfurnish't of a quarrel, and will be sure to be out of Charity at Easter; and indeed he lies not, for hee has a quarrel to the Sacrament. <sup>5</sup>

Thus, many crypto-Catholics avoided fines by nominally conforming. They attended the service according to statute but did not receive communion. Some scholars have argued that this style of conformity was a strategy adopted by those who shied away from the political implications of Catholic separatism.<sup>6</sup> Yet in this article, it will be suggested that church papistry can be viewed itself as just as politically informed an act as the overt separatism urged by Persons and Campion. It will be argued that this kind of conformity was not, as so many scholars imply, a rejection of contemporary Catholic political agendas but instead a carefully judged response to political issues generated by the course pursued by the Elizabethan State. There was more than one Catholic political option available in the 1570s and 1580s and it was not a case of simply distinguishing between political loyalty and religious affiliation.

## I

Voluminous documentation, including wills, domestic accounts and some correspondence, exists for one notable Catholic family, yet little concerted effort has been made to study Sir John Petre, later 1st baron Petre of Writtle. He was the son of Sir William Petre, the latter a man politique in the extreme. Originally, the family was from

South Devon, until William Petre<sup>7</sup> came to Essex, served four Tudor monarchs – including over ten years as principal secretary of state – built Ingatestone Hall (near Chelmsford) and acquired vast estates.<sup>8</sup>

William Petre's second wife was Anne Tyrrell (née Browne).<sup>9</sup> John Petre, the individual upon whom this article is focussed, was the couple's third (but only surviving) son. He was born in 1549, Reginald, Cardinal Pole later acting as his confirmation sponsor.<sup>10</sup> In 1567, John Petre was admitted into the Middle Temple and on 17 April 1570 married Mary, daughter of Sir Edward Waldegrave, who had been prominent in Mary I's reign and had subsequently died in the Tower of London for hearing Mass and harbouring priests.<sup>11</sup> John Petre chose his own wife, an unusual act at this level of society and one that may have been governed by religious considerations.<sup>12</sup> It was noted by the Catholic exile, Sir Francis Englefield, that John's parents were delighted with his decision,<sup>13</sup> even though the bride's father had been a political prisoner and a strong Catholic.

On the death of Sir William, on 13 January 1571/72, John succeeded to his father's vast estates. Perhaps not reaching the same 'dizzy heights' as his father, like membership of the Privy Council, John was, as Edwards describes him, 'a county magnate of considerable eminence, who carried out his public duties seriously and thoroughly.'<sup>14</sup> He was apparently an entirely loyal servant of the Crown and scrupulously conformist. He was High Sheriff of Essex 1575–76<sup>15</sup> and was knighted at the end of his tenure. From 1584–87, he was knight of the shire for Essex, then the Deputy Lord Lieutenant of Essex from 1588–1603, as well as commander of a regiment of 600 local men levied in order to repel the attempted Armada invasion. He was collector of the forced loan for Essex from

1590 to 1598,<sup>16</sup> as well as one of the commissioners for the county musters.<sup>17</sup>

Furthermore, he was a prominent Essex magistrate from 1573 onwards and also sat on the commission of justices charged to examine and restrain papists and seminary priests in the south-east corner of Essex, not to mention the 1591/92 commission against Jesuits and seminary priests.<sup>18</sup> In 1603, James I raised John to the peerage as Baron Petre of Writtle.<sup>19</sup> He died on 11 October 1613.

John Petre was, however, one of those whom many contemporaries would have called a ‘church papist’. According to a former servant of the Petres, the informer George Eliot, in 1581:

The said S[i]r John [Petre] had many tymes before p[er]swaded me to go to the churche for fashion[n] sake, and in respect to avoide the daunger of the lawe; yet to keepe myne owne conscience. And then at the same time, he p[er]swaded me to do the lyke sayinge I might lawfullie doe it and furdur saithe he [‘]do you thincke there are not that goe to the churche that beare as good a mynde to godwarde, as those th[a]t refuse, yes and if occasion serve wilbe able to doe better s[er]vice then they w[hi]ch refuse to go to the churche. Yet would I not for anye thinge wishe you to p[ar]ticipate w[i]th them eyther in there prayers or com[m]union.[’] And I verylie thincke S[i]r John[n]e[s] althoughe he Goethe to the churche dothe not receave the com[m]union.<sup>20</sup>

Eliot was not the most reliable of witnesses,<sup>21</sup> but there is no reason to think he was lying in this case. The timing of this allegation is highly significant. Eliot's remarks were contextualised by the contemporary debate over recusancy and occasional conformity.<sup>22</sup> On Eliot's account, Petre was saying that it was ludicrous to think that the range of Catholic responses to contemporary issues was linked to out-and-out separation. Instead, Petre was using his church papistry as a disguise, a false visage behind which he was able to operate and 'doe better s[er]vice then they w[hi]ch refuse to go to the churche'.

Put bluntly, John Petre claimed to be seeking to promote the interests of his co-religionists even if he was not opting for full scale recusancy. If anything, his words to Eliot can be viewed as an ill-timed 'spitting of the dummy', the words of a man irritated by the notion that he was not a strong Catholic because of his occasional conformity and was somehow guilty of betraying his faith. Therefore, Questier is only partly correct when he comments that this outward conformity allowed some Catholics to maintain a distinct identity, undermining the State's intention.<sup>23</sup> It was more than this – Petre's actions suggest that such people could positively agitate for Catholic political objectives.

## II

Of course, all this is a long way from suggesting that John Petre was some sort of Jesuitical sleeper. However, his social circle was riddled with Catholics prior to the Jesuits' 1580 arrival. For example, Lewis Barlow, one of the first four seminary priests to return to England and the man the Jesuit Robert Persons credited with coming up with the idea of the 1580 mission,<sup>24</sup> had entered the Middle Temple only three months after John

and seems to be mentioned in some Petre family accounts.<sup>25</sup> His ministry was located close to the Petres, most notably at Borley in Essex,<sup>26</sup> home of the Waldegraves, John's in-laws. Thus, John probably knew one of the first Catholic missionaries to England and it surely cannot be dismissed as mere coincidence that this individual then ministered to members of John's family. Certainly, he was known by the Petre servant and later renegade Eliot.<sup>27</sup>

During the 1570s and 1580s, the priest with arguably the strongest links to the family was John Payne. Payne entered Douai College in 1574.<sup>28</sup> Often neglected is just what a close relationship there was between Douai and the Jesuits at this time, a quarter of the College's founding members entering the Society.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, the college's head, William Allen, continually suggested Jesuits for the mission, and wrote to this effect to Claudio Aquaviva, the Jesuit Father General, on several occasions.<sup>30</sup>

Payne was heavily associated with members of the Society. He had doubts about the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist during his time at Douai. However, at the first Mass of a fellow missionary, he allegedly received a vision of the crucified Jesus rising from the chalice. He immediately informed his Jesuit confessor. William Allen's friend, the Catholic polemicist Gregory Martin, wrote to Edmund Campion on the matter.<sup>31</sup>

Payne was ordained on 7 April 1576. Shortly after he left for England with Cuthbert Mayne, but not before the pair had been on a Jesuit retreat.<sup>32</sup> Mayne's and Payne's other travelling partner, Henry Shaw, had been at St John's College, Oxford. Both Shaw and Mayne had been contemporaries of Campion; the latter had been a room-mate of the famed Jesuit.<sup>33</sup> Andrew Hegarty has suggested that Payne had also been at the college.<sup>34</sup> After some difficulties in crossing, Payne was in Essex, apparently at Ingatestone Hall,

home of John's mother, by 15 July 1576, at which time George Godsalf arrived at Douai with a letter from Payne which strongly urged the sending of more priests.<sup>35</sup> Payne, therefore, must have gone almost directly to the Petres, a family which was headed by a leading conformist; in short, he knew where to go.

Subsequently, Payne was arrested at Anne, Lady Petre's house at the start of 1577.<sup>36</sup> He was, however, soon released<sup>37</sup> and he was listed as Anne Petre's servant in a government report filed in November 1577.<sup>38</sup> Shortly after this he arrived at Douai on 14 November 1577 with three law students, whom he took to Paris the following day.<sup>39</sup> By June 1578, he was again back at Ingatestone Hall; he witnessed Anne, Lady Petre's will.<sup>40</sup> He then seems to have flitted back and forth between the continent and England, as confirmed by the priest Robert Johnson, another of Eliot's 'victims', who had replied to Eliot's claim not to know where Payne was that the priest had 'gone beyond the seas.'<sup>41</sup> Eliot claimed that Payne was at Ingatestone around Christmas 1579, one of the few allegations Payne did not deny.<sup>42</sup> At some point around 1579 he was also in London, for Henry Chadderton, on his arrival at the English College, Rome, in 1599 claimed that he and his sister had 'hired rooms in the house of a pious Catholic woman who was frequently visited by Jesuits ... In the same house there lived the future martyr, Mr Payne the priest.' At this time, Chadderton was in contact with Thomas Pound, a Jesuit laybrother.<sup>43</sup> Chadderton was also related to Ralph Bickley SJ.<sup>44</sup> Payne was clearly in touch with the Jesuit network. Interestingly, the Jesuits had not arrived by this time, yet Chadderton blatantly describes the house as being frequented by Jesuits. Perhaps this means that it became so after the Jesuits' arrival, a matter telling in itself, or that the house was perceived to be a Jesuit base, meaning that Payne was understood by some to



have close relations with them. Certainly, at his execution, the crowd believed Payne to be a Jesuit.<sup>45</sup> Continuing his trips to the continent, Payne also may have been in Paris in 1580.<sup>46</sup>

Payne was captured in Warwickshire in July 1581,<sup>47</sup> having allegedly said Mass at William More's house at Haddon, Oxfordshire; the family were part of the extended Petre network. Eliot claimed to have been present and that Godsalf said Mass there two days later.<sup>48</sup>

Following his arrest, Payne was sent to the Tower and tortured brutally.<sup>49</sup> However, despite the trial of Edmund Campion and the others all revolving around Eliot's claims that Payne had been the mastermind behind a plot to kill the queen,<sup>50</sup> Payne was not tried with them. Rather he was tried separately in the Essex assizes held at Chelmsford. Considering that he was alleged to have been such a major player in the conspiracy, whose infamy continued long after his death, even being raked up as part of the indictment against Philip Howard, earl of Arundel in 1589,<sup>51</sup> why was Payne not sentenced with Campion and the other accused? The most probable answer is that it was designed to teach someone a lesson. Considering that the Petres were so strongly Catholic and that Payne had such close links with them, the likely intended recipients of this stern rebuke were John and his family. When the Privy Council confirmed the place of Payne's trial in March 1581/82 to the Essex justices of assize,<sup>52</sup> John's position must have been extremely uncomfortable. That the sentence of execution was carried out in Chelmsford only serves to underline the primary purpose of the proceedings.

Just over a month after Payne's execution on 2 April 1582, a letter was sent from the Court dated 20 May. Signed by Thomas Radcliffe, 3rd earl of Sussex, it stated:

... The Q[ueen's] moste excellent Ma[jes]te beinge enformed that the Ladie Peeter is p[re]sented for a Recusant, And understandinge that at this p[re]sent she is greate w[i]th Chylde, hathe of her gratiouse favo[u]r and upon good Respecte[s] bene pleased that all p[ro]cedinge[s] againste her for any presentment or Indytement in any suche Cause should be Stayed, untell her Ma[jes]te shoulde signifie her pleasure to the Contrarye.<sup>53</sup>

The timing of this letter is extremely interesting and could be interpreted as an effort to stop the alienation of a wealthy and powerful family over religion.<sup>54</sup> However, there is another possible interpretation. The earl of Sussex was heavily involved in the recent attempt to secure the proposed marriage between the queen and Francois, duke of Anjou, the youngest son of Catherine de Medici. Sussex was the principal councillor champion of the match. It has been argued that the Jesuits' mission to England in 1580 was connected with this projected marriage. Rumours were circulating that the queen was looking for Catholic or crypto-Catholic supporters for the proposed marriage,<sup>55</sup> whilst Catholics were reporting that, therefore, it was an appropriate time for clergy from the continent to present themselves in England. Sussex himself was gathering a group of noblemen around him in support of the proposed marriage who at the very least were regarded as Catholic sympathisers. Among these Catholic supporters of the marriage there were some who urged the launch of a Jesuit mission to England. Only several of these marriage supporters are known, but they included William Cornwallis and Frederick Windsor, 4th baron Windsor, both of whom were in contact with John Petre

around this time.<sup>56</sup> In other words, the Jesuit mission may have originated from English Catholics; as Lake and Questier argue, ‘the genesis of the mission is to be found in English Catholics’ perceptions of an opportunity for an explosive entrée into English politics at a time when the regime seemed to be in crisis.’<sup>57</sup> John and his wife attended the Court from October 1580 to early summer 1581, just when the marriage negotiations were taking place.<sup>58</sup> Sussex certainly knew John, the latter’s account books recording that the two were in contact in August of that same year.<sup>59</sup> He had a home at nearby New Hall in Boreham and presented a ‘standing cuppe’ to John’s first-born son, William, acting as the child’s godfather.<sup>60</sup> Moreover, John was included in Sussex’s will in a list of local notables who were described as ‘my loving friends’. He acted as an executor of the will and surviving papers show that he conscientiously performed this role.<sup>61</sup> Furthermore, the Petres’ ‘family patron’, Lord Burghley, acted as the will’s overseer; he was also a supporter of the Anjou Match.<sup>62</sup> Therefore, Sussex, a privy councillor and lord chamberlain of the Household, had perhaps personally intervened with the queen on the Petres’ behalf, as the letter shows no sign of having originated from the Privy Council. All this was secured at the very time he was gathering Catholic noblemen around him, including acquaintances of John, for support of the audacious marriage plan, and whilst these very same Catholics were advising that the time was apt for the Jesuits’ mission.

Let us consider this evidence. Before his final arrest in July 1581, when he was back in England, Payne had been shuttling between his homeland and the continent. He had also been in contact with a fledgling Jesuit network at home and abroad, and had written to Douai urging the sending of more priests, claiming the time was apt for their arrival. All this fits into the timescale of the build up to the Jesuit mission to England.

Immediately after his execution, his main patrons, the Petres, received protection from recusancy charges thanks to a letter signed by one of the prime advocates of the Anjou match, the ‘crisis’ that precipitated the Jesuits’ arrival. Moreover, amongst English Catholics at the time, Payne seemingly received more prominence than many other martyrs.<sup>63</sup> As we saw above, such was Payne’s apparent infamy that Eliot was able to pretend that Campion’s arrest had been merely a happy by-product of his search for the priest, though the dates do not fit his claims.<sup>64</sup> In short, I argue that Payne was a go-between, the middle man connecting England and those abroad who were in the process of putting the Jesuit mission in place. As Questier and Lake suggest, the impetus for the mission seemingly came from English lay Catholics. Considering his activities and ties to the principal proponent of the Anjou match, as well as his being head of the family sheltering a possible Jesuit go-between, the evidence strongly suggests John Petre’s involvement with the institution of the Jesuit mission to England.

### III

In this context it is worth considering the contacts John Petre had in Rome at the very launching of the Society’s 1580 mission to England.

The Petres had close ties with the Pascalls of Great Baddow, Essex; the families were related and Robert Pascall was Anne, Lady Petre’s godson.<sup>65</sup> Moreover, John Petre had regular contact with this family: some of them appeared in his account books as early as April 1570.<sup>66</sup> Like many other Catholic families, the Pascalls employed an unlicensed tutor.<sup>67</sup> In 1576, the Archdeaconry Court recorded that one ‘Godsafe’ was living in the

house of Pascall of Great Baddow, yet was a recusant and teaching boys without licence.<sup>68</sup> This tutor was almost certainly George Godsalf, the former Marian deacon who Payne had sent abroad to become a priest and with whom he was captured.<sup>69</sup> The family also had links with the later renegade priest Anthony Tyrell, as did the Petres.<sup>70</sup> The Catholic networks to which the Petres belonged are very prominent here.

Of particular interest is John Pascall, who, though hard to place in the pedigree, was certainly one of the Pascalls of Great Baddow.<sup>71</sup> There had been an Andrew Pascall at Exeter College, entering in 1575. Another one, whose first name is unknown, was there in 1572.<sup>72</sup> With near certainty, this latter figure can be identified as John Pascall, who, according to Persons, had been a ‘schollar to M[aste]r Sherwin in Oxford & dearly beloved of him, & being young & sanguin of complexion is fervent in his religion would oftentimes breake forth into zealus speeches offring much of himself’.<sup>73</sup> This proximity is underlined in a letter sent by Ralph Sherwin to the former Exeter College student Ralph Bickley, by that time in Rome, in which he writes ‘M[aste]r Paschall saluteth you hartely’. The letter was dated from Paris on 11 June 1580, a time when Payne was rumoured also to be in the city.<sup>74</sup>

Pascall had arrived in Douai on 29 August 1577,<sup>75</sup> shortly after Godsalf’s June arrival – had Payne also sent Pascall abroad? From 1578, the privy council belatedly developed concerns about Pascall’s whereabouts and his recusancy.<sup>76</sup> By 1579 Pascall was in Rome and was recorded as a theological student at the English College.<sup>77</sup> This meant that he was there at the time of unrest in the college; he was on the side that asked for Jesuits to be appointed as administrators there.<sup>78</sup>

Pascall was a leading figure in the college and in the Jesuit mission to England. It was seemingly Pascall's job to quiz new arrivals, both for news from England and for their purpose in coming to the college. According to a spy, throughout July and August 1579, Pascall asked several new English arrivals about the proposed Anjou match, and displayed a good deal of bitterness towards the queen while he did so.<sup>79</sup> Furthermore, when William Allen arrived in September 1579 to discuss preparations for a possible Jesuit mission, 'his chiefeste gide & only companyon & of his counsell was John Pasquall, and used him in all matters as before I [i.e. the spy] have said both at whome and abroad, at meat & meale.' As such, 'at that tyme begane Pasquall to florische & everye thinge w[hi]ch was to be used in any manner of respecte muste firste be demaunded of M[aste]r Pasquall whether he had any likinge of it. His yea was never refused & his naye never disliked.' Therefore, it is hardly surprising that when discussions about those to embark on the Jesuit mission took place in October 1579, 'Pasquales credite was suche that thos w[hi]ch he nominated & made sure to him were appointed', whilst he also became 'solisiter' to the pope for support. In February 1579/80, it was decided to send six priests and four gentlemen to England:

Of w[hi]ch companye John Pasquall was appointed one of the chefest / his office as the chiefeste paye master / that is to saye/ to provide meate drinke & clothe / and all things nedfull for the prestes as well in ther travell as in England<sup>80</sup>

On 18 April 1580, Pascall was one of those who set off from Rome with Persons and Campion on the founding Jesuit mission to England.<sup>81</sup> He was present when the group met Cardinal Borromeo in Milan and appears to have continued his leading role in the mission; it was he, Campion and Sherwin who confronted Theodore Beza in Geneva.<sup>82</sup> It was decided that Pascall should enter England through Rouen with Sherwin.<sup>83</sup> However, like the others, Pascall was taken prisoner after several months in England<sup>84</sup> and, though initially standing firm, wilted under threat of torture.<sup>85</sup> Nevertheless, his prominence in the mission cannot be doubted; as Campion said at his own trial, Pascall was as ‘guilty’ as he.<sup>86</sup> This was a man with whom the Petres had close contact.

However, he was not the only one – there was another, just as prominent, also with close Petre ties. In fact, it is these Petre connections that appear to explain the proximity between Pascall and Ralph Sherwin. As already noted, Sherwin had been John Pascall’s tutor at Exeter College, Oxford. He had been a Petrean fellow, nominated by John Petre’s father, yet John gave him permission to go abroad with the future Jesuit, John Currie, in 1575. The college continued to list him as a fellow until 1577, despite his already being ordained at Douai.<sup>87</sup> Through the Exeter College link, Sherwin also maintained a significant friendship with the future Jesuit, Ralph Bickley, who followed him to Rome.<sup>88</sup>

Like his companion Pascall, Sherwin was to play a decisive role in the English College, Rome. It was here that he formed an extremely close relationship with the Jesuits, so much so that he was regularly mistaken for a member of the Society.<sup>89</sup> He had arrived in Rome in 1577 and became heavily involved in the agitation at the college. As one of its leaders, he delivered a series of damning indictments against what he saw as the lackadaisical Welsh administration. Moreover, Sherwin was the principal agitator for

the institution of Jesuit control. During this time, he was in regular advisory contact with Persons, who suggested the missionary oath, which Sherwin was the first to swear.<sup>90</sup>

With such proximity and the compatibility of their ideals, it is little wonder that Sherwin was ready to pledge his life both for the conversion of England and for the Jesuit way of proceeding.<sup>91</sup>

Thus, Sherwin was chosen to accompany the Jesuit mission to England, despite being a secular priest. Persons describes Sherwin as being one of the principal members of the group, often seemingly working on a par with Campion, and speaking excellently in front of Cardinal Borromeo.<sup>92</sup> The future Petre-chaplain, Henry More SJ, later recorded that Persons and Sherwin remained in regular contact throughout the mission, Persons being responsible for the Jesuit wing.<sup>93</sup> Sherwin was executed with Campion and Alexander Briant, both Jesuits, reportedly even kissing the hands of the executioner once he had finished butchering Campion, a sign of both his readiness for martyrdom and his closeness to Campion.<sup>94</sup>

Sherwin's proximity to Persons and the Society is revealed in a letter later sent by the Jesuit to Agazzari in Rome, commenting that 'Your Sherwin who burned with such zeal at Rome, with no less ardour of spirit' preached relentlessly wherever he could.<sup>95</sup> The personalisation indicated by his describing Sherwin as 'belonging' to Agazzari is very strong. Agazzari had become head of the English College following Sherwin's campaign, yet Persons' words indicate a deeper relationship than mere college rector to student: it is as if the two Jesuits viewed Sherwin as 'one of their own'. As such, his memory was invoked when the college was engulfed by the archpriest controversy<sup>96</sup> at the end of the



sixteenth century. Cardinal Sega was called upon to investigate the disagreements and noted:

Shame upon those students who gainsay the judgement [to maintain Jesuit control of the College] and wish of those who when the College was going to be founded were the first to propose that it should be placed under the government of the Society, of the two Sherwins, Cornelius, and Briant, and other martyrs of Christ, who, as the students well know, were ever most closely attached to the Society.<sup>97</sup>

In the view of all, even after the event, Sherwin was inseparable from the Jesuit mission. Furthermore, the three men highlighted by Sega as instrumental in the College's Jesuit ethos, and key allies of the Society, were all tied to the Petres in some way.<sup>98</sup>

#### **IV**

We have seen that John Petre was in contact with a network both at home and abroad. There were people at the seminaries who knew John well and it seems reasonable to conclude that they were part of the reason for John's proximity not just to the seminary priests, but especially to the Jesuits. However, there is surviving evidence of an extensive cross-Channel network of which John was a central member.

John Woodward, a rather neglected figure, looks like one of McGrath's and Rowe's old Marian priests who prepared the way for the seminary-trained missionaries.<sup>99</sup> He had

been rector of Ingatestone parish church 1556–66 before resigning in protest at the ongoing church reforms; he subsequently became chaplain to the Petres at Ingatestone Hall.<sup>100</sup> By 23 May 1577, Woodward was recorded as being at Douai.<sup>101</sup> As with the Marian deacon Godsalf, it may have been Payne who sent Woodward abroad for his ‘refresher’ course in Tridentine Catholicism.<sup>102</sup> Woodward’s involvement with John Petre did not cease there. In November 1576, John’s accounts note that ten pounds was delivered to ‘Rice Gruffith M[aste]r Talbotte[s] man the ix<sup>th</sup> daie at London to be delv[er]ed to M[aste]r Jo[hn] Woodward.’ A similar entry on 6 May 1577 records that forty shillings were sent via the same man.<sup>103</sup> The accounts of John Petre’s brother-in-law, John Talbot, reveal Griffith regularly made this cross-Channel run. For example, on 4 November 1576, John Talbot gave twenty pounds ‘in London to the handes of Rice to be made over to M[aste]r George Talbott to Arras’, whilst on 30 August 1578, as on several other occasions, Griffith returned from abroad with money, including some from Antwerp.<sup>104</sup> In other words, Talbot had a man who was travelling abroad and maintaining regular contact with Catholic exiles. Moreover, John Petre was using this go-between.

However, Woodward was not merely seeing out his days in sunnier and more ‘Catholic’ climes. Having left England in the autumn of 1578 and before he arrived in Rome on 1 February 1578/79, the anti-Catholic propagandist Anthony Munday had stopped off at Amiens in France, where he was ‘given to understand that there was an old English priest in the town, whose name was Master Woodward.’ Thus, with his companion, Munday duly sought out the said priest for the particular purpose of securing some form of aid to help in his journey to Rome. Less than cryptically, Woodward allegedly replied:

I am a poor priest, and here I live for my conscience' sake, whereas, were things according as they should be, it were better for me to be at home in mine own country. And yet trust me, I pity to see any of my countrymen lack, though I am not able anyway to relieve them: there be daily that cometh this way to whom, according to my ability, I am liberal, but they be such as you are not, they come not for pleasure but for profit, they come not to see every idle toy, and to learn a little language, but to learn how to save both their own and their friends' souls, and such I would you were, then I could say that to you, while (as you be) I may not.<sup>105</sup>

This was perhaps not the greatest missionary speech but apparently Woodward ploughed on regardless during the walk to the lodgings he was willing to offer them, all the while urging their conversion and extolling the virtues of the pope whilst slandering the queen and her lackeys on the privy council.<sup>106</sup> The following morning he called the travellers to him, again willing their conversion. They agreed, prompting Woodward to write letters to William Allen at Rheims, one recommending them for priestly formation and the other detailing news of England, perhaps supplied to him through Rice Griffith's visits. He then willed them to commend him to Allen.<sup>107</sup> Therefore, Woodward was not willing away the hours of his retirement but was arguably a major 'bridging point' in the Catholic missionary network. It was seemingly known that he was the man to see if one wanted to become a priest. Moreover, he was clearly on friendly terms with Allen, at this time the undisputed leader of the English missionary effort. As such, Munday does not

hesitate to name Woodward's activities in the same breath as those of Allen; he was allegedly a central cog in the process of gaining Englishmen for the seminaries.

Notably, Pascall and Sherwin visited Woodward in Rouen on their way into England with the 1580 Jesuit mission.<sup>108</sup> Woodward was Sherwin's uncle and had played an important role in securing Sherwin's election as a Petrean Fellow at Exeter College, Oxford. Sherwin himself recognised this, as well as his emotional bond with his uncle, in a letter written to him the day before his martyrdom.<sup>109</sup> Thus, Sherwin and Pascall had strong connections both with John Petre and with one of Petre's other clerical clients. Moreover, Woodward appears at this time as a signatory to a letter supporting the exiled Bridgettine community in Rouen.<sup>110</sup> Nuns from the convent had been present at Lyford when Campion was captured.<sup>111</sup> Interestingly, after Campion's execution in 1581, Persons headed to Rouen and became a strong advocate of the community.<sup>112</sup> In view of the fact that he was aware of Woodward, it seems highly likely that Woodward was known to him, especially as Woodward was reported as still being there in November 1582.<sup>113</sup>

Woodward continued to be active in the English Catholic cause. In October 1584, a spy reported that those in Rouen included 'M[aste]r Peeters a priest uncle to S[i]r John Peters M[aste]r Woodward & M[aste]r Clitherall priest[s]'. Moreover, the spy reported Woodward's involvement in a network supplying money for the English mission and the informant also detailed a route into the country through Great Yarmouth in Norfolk.<sup>114</sup> From the report, the exact nature of Woodward's role is unclear, but he was certainly identified as a go-between for the Catholics in England and those on the continent. As he

was in contact with John Petre and his brother-in-law, Talbot, it seems highly likely that they formed part of this same network.

Thus, in the context of this network, the question of how so many priests knew to go directly to the Petres or their circle may possibly be answered. The suspicion is further strengthened by remembering Woodward's apparent contact with Persons, the Jesuit describing him as "a very grave priest".<sup>115</sup> The latter had established a scheme for sending priests back to England with Rouen his operational centre.<sup>116</sup>

## V

Traditionally, the life of John Petre, 1st baron Petre, has been presented as one of weak conformity. He has typically been dismissed as one of the new breed of country gentleman, reluctant to risk material well-being for something as trifling as conscience. Up to a point, this view is correct: John Petre did offer tacit conformity to the regime, providing mundane, yet apparently loyal, service throughout his life. Like many church papists, he had a wife who was a determined recusant, the daughter of a man who had died imprisoned in the Tower of London for his faith. John's presence at the Middle Temple, something of a bastion of church papistry, only seems to confirm the point: John was nothing more than a 'middle-of-the-road' church papist.

However, there were whisperings that constantly dogged him. Not only was his wife Catholic, but so too were most of his family. There were accusations that nominations to the Petrean fellowships at Exeter College were simply a ruse for promoting Catholic candidates.<sup>117</sup> Indeed, many of the individuals involved in the launch of the English

mission, and especially the Jesuit component from 1580, were linked to John in some way. Besides accommodating the priest who connected the planners of the Jesuit mission and England, John's family also had extensive ties to the main protagonists on the Jesuit mission itself; two leading figures – Ralph Sherwin and John Pascall – were well known to the Petre circle. Moreover, John had demonstrable contact with English Catholic exiles living on the Continent, most notably the family's former chaplain, the Marian priest John Woodward. In addition, he was linked to those involved in the Anjou match negotiations that precipitated the Jesuits' arrival. Either we must accept that John Petre was the unluckiest man alive, in that he always seemed to pick 'bad-eggs' for his friends, and just happened to find himself in the frame or on the periphery of such a major Catholic and national event, or else his role and church papistry needs radical re-assessment. This article has argued for the latter, demonstrating that John Petre was anything but a meek, quaking-in-his-boots conformist. Instead, he was a key, if covert, figure in the formation of Catholic networks that crossed national boundaries.

The church papistry adopted by John Petre was markedly different to that of other prominent conformists. For example, Sir Anthony Browne, first viscount Montague, would only entertain clergy ordained in England during Mary I's reign. He refused patronage to the seminarists and Jesuits, possibly out of loyalty to a regime that was hostile towards these 'new' clergy. Montague's cousin, John Gage of West Firle in Sussex, appears to have done the same.<sup>118</sup> Donna Hamilton has controversially argued that Anthony Munday, who wrote a sensational account of his visit to the English College, Rome, was also a church papist, though of a politically loyalist persuasion.<sup>119</sup> The lines between recusancy, church papistry and conformity were not clear, as

demonstrated by a case in York in the later 1580s. In this example, involving the executed laywoman Margaret Clitherow, the Catholic laity and clergy were engaged in debates about to what degree offering outward attendance at Protestant services even constituted conformity and acceptance of the religious settlement.<sup>120</sup> As such, it is hardly surprising that a significant voice amongst the authorities, particularly that of godly Protestants, viewed some conformists as even more dangerous than ‘honest’ separatists; those hiding behind a ‘false visage’ were able to disguise their activities from necessary scrutiny.<sup>121</sup> John Petre may, therefore, be a distinctive example but it would appear that the association between church papistry and conformity has been overdrawn. His behaviour would indicate that the term ‘church papist’ is very imprecise and a far more nuanced understanding is required.

Such a scenario has links to contemporary issues of tolerance and religious integration. The obvious allusion is to the experience of the Muslim community in the UK. A passing glance at any media outlet will reveal modern expression of the ‘extremist/moderate’ debate given voice about this particular faith-group.<sup>122</sup> Nevertheless, the comparison can be overdone: whilst there are obvious similarities, there are also striking differences. For example, there is no law banning Muslim clerics entering the country as there was against Catholic priests in the Early Modern period. Moreover, whilst a Muslim could theoretically become the monarch, Catholics remain barred from this lofty position through the Act of Settlement, still in force today and, despite the talk of reforms allowing royal daughters to ascend the throne, there is no sign of this institutional discrimination being removed from the statute books.

A better fit may be to point to the dangers of when a State attempts to dictate which parts of a major religion are acceptable. Eamon Duffy has noted that the Reformation under Henry VIII began with the crown ‘asserting a new power over conscience and over the English Church, which no modern Englishman would be likely nowadays to put up with for a second.’ In short, the crown ‘asserted an unprecedented right ... to redefine what the Christian faith was’.<sup>123</sup> In fact, modern incarnations of a similar mind-set abound, this time with the secular, allegedly neutral state in the position of the crown. In France, Muslim women are banned from wearing the burka, the secular authorities decreeing that it is not a matter of faith. In the UK, the law courts decide that it is not an expression of Christian conviction to wear a cross, a decision Shami Chakrabarti, the director of Liberty, described as a ‘theological adjudication that secular courts are not supposed to do.’ Indeed, she asserted, such a decision ‘interferes with someone’s right to manifest their religion if you prevent them doing something that they consider to be an expression of their faith,’ and stated bluntly, ‘The notion that there is a bright line between private sphere where you can do what you like and the public and work space where you check an important part of your personality at the door can have, I think, dangerous and unintended consequences for everyone.’<sup>124</sup> As such, a near farcical paradox develops where the self-professedly secular state makes self-evidently theological decisions about what are and what are not fundamental tenets of major world religions. Whilst purporting to allow freedom of conscience in private, it simultaneously legislates about it in public, creating a dichotomy between the two and attempting to force a split between the inward faith and its outward expression. In the Early Modern



period, John Petre was one amongst many forced by the state to make just such a division between the public and the private.

---

In the text, split dates have been used between 1 Jan. and 24 Mar. Original spelling in all quotations from early modern manuscripts has been retained, except for the transposition of i to j, u to v, v to u, and y to i, where necessary in order to conform to modern usage. The following abbreviations have been used: *Calendar of state papers, domestic series*, eds. M. A. E. Green and R. Lemon (12 volumes for 1547–1625, London 1856–72) as *CSPD*; *Acts of the Privy Council of England 1542–1628*, eds. J. R. Dasent *et al.*, (46 volumes, London 1890–1964) as *APC*.

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to David Crankshaw, Michael Questier and Bill Sheils for their comments on this article at various stages of its development.

<sup>2</sup> A. Luders *et al.* (eds.), *The Statutes of the Realm*, 11 volumes (London: Record Commission, 1810–28), iv, p. 357.

<sup>3</sup> Luders, *Statutes*, pp. 657–8.

<sup>4</sup> P. Lake and M. C. Questier, ‘Puritans, papists and the “public sphere” in early modern England: the Edmund Campion affair in context’, in *The Journal of Modern History* 72 (2000), 605–11.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted in A. Walsham, *Church papists: Catholicism, conformity and confessional polemic in early modern England* (2nd edition, Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1999), p. 96.

<sup>6</sup> J. Bossy, *The English Catholic community 1570–1850* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1975), p. 157; M. C. Questier, *Catholicism and community in early modern England: politics, aristocratic patronage and religion, c.1550–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 162–7.

<sup>7</sup> F. G. Emmison, *Tudor secretary: Sir William Petre at court and home* (London: Longmans, 1961); article on Sir William Petre, by C. S. Knighton, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* accessed online June 2012.

---

<sup>8</sup> W. R. Emerson, 'The economic development of the estates of the Petre family in Essex in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', unpublished D.Phil dissertation (Oxford, 1951), p. 32.

<sup>9</sup> Emerson, 'Economic Development', p. 52.

<sup>10</sup> C. T. Kuypers, 'Thorndon: its history and its associations: part III', in *The Brentwood Diocesan Magazine* 3 (1920), 80.

<sup>11</sup> A. C. Edwards, *John Petre: essays on the life and background of John, 1st lord Petre, 1549–1613*, (London and New York: Regency Press, 1975), p. 17; article on Sir Edward Waldegrave, by A. Weikel, in *ODNB*. For the Waldegraves' Catholicism, see B. C. Foley, 'The breaking of the storm', in *Essex Recusant* [hereinafter cited as *ER*] 3 (1961), 1-15.

<sup>12</sup> J. Bossy, 'The Counter-Reformation and the people of Catholic Europe', in *Past & Present* 47 (1970), 56.

<sup>13</sup> *CSPD Addenda 1566–79*, p. 279; article on Sir Francis Englefield, by A. J. Loomie, in *ODNB*.

<sup>14</sup> Edwards, *John Petre*, p. 10.

<sup>15</sup> A. Hughes and J. Jennings (comp.), *List of sheriffs for England and Wales from the earliest times to AD1831 compiled from documents in the public record office*, Lists and Indexes, IX (London: Public Record Office, 1898; New York: Kraus Reprint Corporation, 1963), p. 45; *APC 1575–77*, p. 155.

<sup>16</sup> *APC 1590–91*, pp. 185-7; *APC 1596–97*, p. 460; *APC 1597–98*, p. 559.

<sup>17</sup> *APC 1598–99*, pp. 643, 701; *APC 1601–04*, p. 138.

<sup>18</sup> Essex Record Office, MS D/DP/O60.

<sup>19</sup> ERO, MS D/DP/F154 is a general pardon granted by letters patent to John, Lord Petre on James' accession. His son, William, also received one: ERO, MS D/DP/F155.

<sup>20</sup> British Library, MS Lansdowne 33, f. 148r.

<sup>21</sup> See B. C. Foley, 'Bl. John Payne, seminary priest and martyr, 1582', in *ER* 2 (1960), 67-8.

---

<sup>22</sup> See Lake and Questier, 'Puritans, papists', 587-627.

<sup>23</sup> Questier, *Catholicism*, p. 50.

<sup>24</sup> P. Hughes, *The Reformation in England*, vol. 3 (London: Hollis and Carter, 1954), p. 286.

The Mission was the supply of English Catholic priests, trained in specially built seminaries on the continent, to England in an effort to minister to the residual Catholic community and, more expressly, to win the country for Catholicism.

<sup>25</sup> H. F. MacGeagh and H. A. C. Sturgess (eds.), *Register of admissions to the honourable society of the Middle Temple: volume I, fifteenth century to 1781* (London: Butterworth, 1949), p. 31. Barlow may be the individual mentioned in ERO MS D/DP/A17 (receipts, 1568-9); (rewards September 1569 and April 1570).

<sup>26</sup> G. Anstruther, *The seminary priests: a dictionary of the secular clergy of England and Wales 1558-1850*, vol. 1 (Ware and Durham: St. Edmund's College and Ushaw College, 1968), p. 22.

<sup>27</sup> BL, MS Lansdowne 33, f. 145r.

<sup>28</sup> For Payne's life, see Foley, 'Payne', 48-75.

<sup>29</sup> J. Morris, 'Blessed Edmund Campion at Douay', in *The Month* 61 (1887), 35.

<sup>30</sup> T. Clancy, 'The first generation of English Jesuits', in *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* [hereinafter cited as *AHSI*] 57 (1988), 153.

<sup>31</sup> Anon. (ed.), [Fathers of the congregation of the London Oratory], with an introduction by T. F. Knox, *The first and second diaries of the English College, Douay, and an appendix of unpublished documents* (London D. Nutt, 1878), p. 311.

<sup>32</sup> Knox, *Douay*, p. 103.

<sup>33</sup> G. Kilroy, *Edmund Campion: memory and transcription* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), p. 45.

<sup>34</sup> A. Hegarty, *A Biographical register of St John's College, Oxford, 1555-1660* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2011), p. 387. My thanks to Andrew Hegarty for his advice on this point.

---

<sup>35</sup> Knox, *Douay*, p. 107, quoted and translated in Foley, 'Payne', 50. Godsalf subsequently became a priest: Anstruther, *Priests*, p. 133.

<sup>36</sup> Knox, *Douay*, p. 115.

<sup>37</sup> Foley, 'Payne', 51. It is unclear whether he was banished or left of his own accord.

<sup>38</sup> P. Ryan (ed.), 'Diocesan returns of recusants for England and Wales, 1577', *Miscellanea XII*, publications of the Catholic Record Society 22 (London, 1921), p. 49.

<sup>39</sup> Knox, *Douay*, pp. 130-1.

<sup>40</sup> ERO, MS D/DP/F8.

<sup>41</sup> T. B. Howell (ed.), *A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and other Crimes and Misdemeanours from the earliest period to the year 1788, with notes and illustrations*, I, (London: Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1816), p. 1067. Nobody appears to have been surprised that Payne would have done this.

<sup>42</sup> W. Allen, *A briefe historie of the glorious martyrdom of twelve reverend priests: Father Edmund Campion and his companions*, ed. J. H. Pollen (London: Burns & Oates, 1908), pp. 89-90.

<sup>43</sup> Article on Thomas Pounce, by T. M. McCoog, in *ODNB*.

<sup>44</sup> *The English College Rome, Responsa Part I: 1598–1621*, ed. A. Kenny, CRS 54, (London, 1962), p. 57.

<sup>45</sup> Allen, *Briefe Historie*, p. 93.

<sup>46</sup> Foley, 'Payne', 51-2.

<sup>47</sup> The National Archives, E351/142, mem.23d (section for 1580-1).

<sup>48</sup> BL, MS Lansdowne 33, f. 149r. For the Mores as part of the Petre network, see J. E. Kelly, 'Learning to survive: the Petre family and the formation of Catholic communities from Elizabeth I to the eve of the English civil war', unpublished PhD thesis (King's College London, 2008), pp. 84-5.

---

<sup>49</sup> TNA, SP 12/157/24; *APC 1581–2*, 172; Foley, ‘Payne’, 52-5.

<sup>50</sup> BL, MS Lansdowne 33, ff. 147r-147v; Allen, *Briefe Historie*, pp. 89-96.

<sup>51</sup> A. G. Petti (ed), *Recusant Documents from the Ellesmere Manuscripts*, CRS 60 (London, 1968), p. 32.

<sup>52</sup> *APC 1581–2*, p. 347.

<sup>53</sup> ERO, MS Q/SR 81/4.

<sup>54</sup> It should be noted that Lady Petre was pregnant with her second son, John, at the time, though the authorities did not later pursue the charges.

<sup>55</sup> T. M. McCoog, ‘The English Jesuit mission and the French match, 1579–1581’, in *The Catholic Historical Reriew* 87 (2001), 191.

<sup>56</sup> McCoog, ‘French Match’, 187, 190, 209.

<sup>57</sup> Lake and Questier, ‘Puritans, papists’, 612; J. Bossy, ‘English Catholics and the French marriage’, in *Recusant History* [hereinafter cited as *RH*] 5 (1959–60), 2-16; McCoog, ‘French Match’, 185-213; article on Thomas Radcliffe, 3rd earl of Sussex, by W. T. MacCaffrey, in *ODNB*.

<sup>58</sup> D. Mateer, ‘William Byrd, John Petre and Oxford, Bodleian MS Mus. Sch. E.423’, in *The Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* 29 (1996), 25; Kuypers, ‘Thorndon’, 84.

<sup>59</sup> ERO, MS D/DP/A18 (extraordinary charges August 1581).

<sup>60</sup> ERO, MS D/DP/F213; Mateer, ‘Byrd’, 24.

<sup>61</sup> ERO, MSS T/A 557, D/DP/F240/1.

<sup>62</sup> McCoog, ‘French Match’, 191; article on William Cecil, by W. T. MacCaffrey, in *ODNB*.

<sup>63</sup> Foley, ‘Payne’, 68. Notably, Allen informed the rector of the English College, Rome, Alfonso Agazzari SJ, of his death, whilst Persons made several mentions of him: *ibid.*, 74-5; T. M. McCoog, ‘Robert Parsons and Claudio Acquaviva: correspondence’, in *AHSI* 68 (1999), 117.

---

<sup>64</sup> A. F. Pollard (ed.), *Tudor Tracts 1552–1588* (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1964), pp. 454, 473. Payne had already been captured by the time of Campion's arrest on 17 July 1581; Payne was delivered to the Tower on 14 July: Foley, 'Payne', 53. Eliot perhaps implies that he got the scent of Campion's trail whilst hunting and then capturing Payne.

<sup>65</sup> ERO, MS D/DP/F8.

<sup>66</sup> For example, ERO, MSS D/DP/A17 (rewards April 1570), D/DP/A18 (receipts 1 November 1576), D/DP/A24 (28 April 1593, 28 July 1593), D/DP/A28 (October 1596, June 1597), D/DP/A30 (27 December 1595), D/DP/A25 (6 December 1605), D/DP/A26 (5 December 1607, 29 February 1607/8, 13 September 1610), D/DP/A27 (23 February 1613/14), D/DP/E25, ff. 94r-96v.

<sup>67</sup> N. C. Elliot, 'The Roman Catholic community in Essex 1625–1701', unpublished M.Litt. dissertation (Oxford, 1976), p. 52.

<sup>68</sup> M. W. O'Boy, 'The Origins of Essex Recusancy', unpublished PhD thesis (Cambridge, 1995), p. 33.

<sup>69</sup> Kelly, 'Learning to survive', pp. 83-4.

<sup>70</sup> *The troubles of our Catholic forefathers, related by themselves*, vol. 2, ed. J. Morris (London: Burns and Oates, 1875), pp. 294-300, 337; Anstruther, *Priests*, pp. 361-3.

<sup>71</sup> ERO, MS T/G 24/84; M. Bernard, 'Paschall of Great Baddow', in *ER* 8 (1966), 15.

<sup>72</sup> J. Foster, *Alumni Oxoniensis: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1500–1714*, vol. 3, (Oxford: Parker & Co., 1891-92), p. 1125; C. W. Boase, *Registrum Colegii Exoniensis Part II: An Alphabetical Register of the Commoners of Exeter College, Oxford* (Oxford: Baxter, 1894), p. 242.

<sup>73</sup> Archives of the British Province of the Society of Jesus, Collectanea Pi, p. 107.

<sup>74</sup> ASJ, Anglia A I, f. 34r.

<sup>75</sup> Knox, *Douay*, p. 128.

---

<sup>76</sup> *APC 1577–78*, pp. 327–8; M. Gabriel, ‘Essex papists in 1578’, in *ER* 2 (1960), 3.

<sup>77</sup> H. Foley (ed.), *Records of the English province of the Society of Jesus*, vol. 6 (London: Burns and Oates, 1875–83), p. 68; Bernard, ‘Paschall’, 12–13.

<sup>78</sup> Bernard, ‘Paschall’, 13.

<sup>79</sup> BL, MS Harleian 296, ff. 112r–112v. Similar accounts are in BL, MSS Add. 48,029, f. 121r–142v and 48,023, ff. 94r–109v. Negotiations surrounding the proposed marriage were well known on the continent and were much talked about by English exiles: McCoog, ‘French Match’, 195.

<sup>80</sup> Pascall and Allen regularly visited the pope regarding the mission: BL, MS Harleian 296 no.30, ff. 112v–113r.

<sup>81</sup> Foley, *Records*, 6, p. 69.

<sup>82</sup> ASJ, Collectanea Pi, pp. 110–11; Anglia A I, f. 33r.

<sup>83</sup> ASJ, Collectanea Pi, pp. 115; Anglia A I, f. 33v; F. Edwards (ed.), *The Elizabethan Jesuits: ‘Historia Missionis Anglicanae Societatis Jesu’ (1660) of Henry More* (London and Chichester: Phillimore, 1981), p. 129.

<sup>84</sup> *APC 1580–81*, pp. 294–5; TNA, SP 12/149/81, SP 12/149/82, SP 12/149/83.

<sup>85</sup> ASJ, Collectanea Pi, pp. 107–8.

<sup>86</sup> Howell, *State Trials*, p. 1055.

<sup>87</sup> Boase, *Registrum*, p. 50; Ryan, ‘Diocesan returns’, p. 100; for Petre influence at Exeter College, see Kelly, ‘Learning to survive’, pp. 77–81.

<sup>88</sup> ASJ, Anglia A I, ff. 33r–34r.

<sup>89</sup> For example, BL, MS Lansdowne 982, f. 22r.

<sup>90</sup> Foley, *Records*, 6, p. 130.

<sup>91</sup> Edwards, *Elizabethan Jesuits*, p. 68.



---

<sup>92</sup> ASJ, *Collectanea Pi*, pp. 105-6, 110-11. Notably, only Sherwin and Campion were allowed to speak at the mass trial of priests, underlining Sherwin's importance: Edwards, *Elizabethan Jesuits*, p. 174.

<sup>93</sup> Edwards, *Elizabethan Jesuits*, p. 95.

<sup>94</sup> Edwards, *Elizabethan Jesuits*, pp. 128-9, 136; Allen, *Briefe historie*, pp. 34-43. Briant also has Petre links: Kelly, 'Learning to survive', p. 80.

<sup>95</sup> B. Camm, *Lives of the English martyrs*, vol. 2 (London: Burns and Oates, 1905), pp. 379-80.

<sup>96</sup> For an overview of the controversy, see M. C. Questier (ed.), *Newsletters from the archpresbyterate of George Birkhead*, Camden 5th series, vol. 12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). Also J. Bossy, 'Henri IV: The appellants and the Jesuits', in *RH* 8 (1965), 80-122.

<sup>97</sup> Foley, *Records*, 6, p. 52. The mention of two Sherwins is seemingly a mistake.

<sup>98</sup> For Cornelius' Petre links see Kelly, 'Learning to survive', pp. 79-80, 97.

<sup>99</sup> P. McGrath and J. Rowe, 'The Marian priests under Elizabeth I', in *RH* 17 (1984-85), 103-5.

<sup>100</sup> B. C. Foley, 'John Woodward, Marian priest 1530?-1597/8?', in *ER* 4 (1962), 13-15. Woodward had also acted as tutor to John Petre: Kuypers, 'Thorndon', 81.

<sup>101</sup> Knox, *Douay*, p. 121.

<sup>102</sup> William Allen actively encouraged old Marian priests to come and do this: Anon. (ed.) [Fathers of the congregation of the London Oratory], with an introduction by T. F. Knox, *The Letters and Memorials of William Cardinal Allen (1532-1594)* (London: Nutt, 1882), pp. 58-9.

<sup>103</sup> ERO, MS D/DP/A18 (rewards November 1576, 6 May 1577).

---

<sup>104</sup> BL, MS Add. 46,461, ff. 53v, 57r. Griffith later became a priest: Anstruther, *Priests*, p. 381-2, 408. George was John Talbot's son; a Talbot had arrived at Doau with Woodward: for the relationship between Talbot and Petre, see Kelly, 'Learning to survive', pp. 95-8.

<sup>105</sup> P. J. Ayres (ed.), *Anthony Munday: the English roman life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), pp. 7-8.

<sup>106</sup> Ayres, *Munday*, p. 9.

<sup>107</sup> Ayres, *Munday*, pp. 10-13. The letters are not extant.

<sup>108</sup> *Memoirs of Robert Persons SJ*, ed. J. H. Pollen, CRS 2 (London, 1906), p. 199. The pair were definitely in Rouen on 3 July 1580, presumably crossing soon after: P. Ryan, 'Some correspondence of Cardinal Allen, 1579-85, from the Jesuit archives', *Miscellanea VII*, CRS 9 (London, 1911), p. 24.

<sup>109</sup> Foley, 'Woodward', 14; ASJ, Anglia Ai, ff. 46r-46v.

<sup>110</sup> TNA, SP 12/146/114.

<sup>111</sup> Pollard, *Tracts*, p. 460.

<sup>112</sup> Edwards, *Elizabethan Jesuits*, p. 140; V. Houlston, *Catholic resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Persons's Jesuit polemic, 1580-1610* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 49, 125.

<sup>113</sup> TNA, SP 15/27A/124.

<sup>114</sup> TNA, SP 12/173/64. It was also reported that two of Lady Talbot's sons, as well as one of Lady Paulet's, were in Rouen under the charge of a priest called 'Delahyd'. Rice Griffith had delivered a half year annuity to a Mr Delahyde for John Petre: ERO, MS D/DP/A18 (annuities November 1576, 6 May 1577). A David de la Hyde, who was ejected from his fellowship at Merton College, Oxford, for refusing the Oath of Supremacy in 1560, had acted as John's Petre's tutor after Woodward: Mateer, 'Byrd', 22.

<sup>115</sup> Pollen, *Memoirs of Persons*, p. 199.

---

<sup>116</sup> A. Dures, *English Catholicism 1558–1642* (Harlow: Longman, 1998), pp. 22–3.

<sup>117</sup> TNA, SP 12/160/56.

<sup>118</sup> Questier, *Catholicism*, pp. 59–60, 164, 184–6.

<sup>119</sup> D. B. Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics, 1560–1633* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. xvi–xviii.

<sup>120</sup> P. Lake and M. Questier, *The Trials of Margaret Clitherow: Persecution, martyrdom and the politics of sanctity in Elizabethan England* (London: Continuum, 2011), pp. 59–67.

<sup>121</sup> Lake and Questier, *Margaret Clitherow*, p. 141.

<sup>122</sup> For further consideration of this point, see Lake and Questier, *Margaret Clitherow*, pp. xi–xiv.

<sup>123</sup> E. Duffy, *Saints, Sacrilege and Sedition: Religion and conflict in the Tudor Reformation* (London: Bloomsbury, 2012), p. 10.

<sup>124</sup> <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/religion/7547406/Shami-Chakrabarti-judges-fuelling-fears-over-Christians-unfair-treatment.html> date accessed 20 June 2012.